

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/612,754	MOWER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Humera N. Sheikh	1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Humera N. Sheikh. (3) _____

(2) John Guynn. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 06 May 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: Su (2002/0068102); Yegorova (US 6,387,370); Fischer (US 5,433,965); Downton (US 5,411,755).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Humera N. Sheikh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed differences between prior art and instant invention. Namely, Applicant stated that the prior art does not teach the two different forms of Luo Han Guo (both powder and liquid extract forms). Applicant indicated that their combination of ingredients provides for unique, synergistic effects of both sweetening and flavor masking. Proposed claim amendments were also discussed. Examiner suggested to incorporate specific concentration ranges for each of the ingredients claimed. Examiner indicated that claims drawn the specific Examples disclosed in the specification can be presented, which would appear allowable. Applicant's response is currently due and will be reviewed for the determination of allowable subject matter. No agreement was reached at this time.